NOMENCLATURAL NOTES FOR THE NORTH AMERICAN FLORA. IX

John T. Kartesz & Kancheepuram N. Gandhi

The North Carolina Botanical Garden, Dept. of Biology, Coker Hall, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599-3280 U.S.A.

ABSTRACT

Authorship of new Cyperaceae names, proposed in Small's 1903 work and of Carex emmonsii Dewey ex Torr. is discussed. Linnaeus' treatment of Cyperus haspan L. as an intentional orthographic error for C. halpan is accepted. Based on priority, the following are recognized to be the correct names at specific rank: Cyperus involucratus Rottb., Eleocharis acutangula (Roxb.) Schultes, and Scirpus leptolepis Chapman in place of C. alternifolius Rottb., E. fistulosa Schultes, and S. cylindricus (Torr.) Britt., respectively. Furtado's lectotypification of Scirpus geniculatus L. is accepted and consequently, Eleocharis geniculata (L.) Roemer & Schultes is reinstated in place of E. caribaea (Rottb.) Blake. The correct status of Phaeocephalum Ehrh. ex House is discussed. In substantive, the spelling berteroi is maintained over berterii. Chapman's 1860 proposals of Rhynchospora divergens Chapman and R. pusilla Chapman as spp. nov. are regarded as isonyms. The quadrinomial Carex marina Dewey ssp. pseudolagopina (Sorensen) Bocher var. pseudolagopina is recognized as two trinomials: Carex marina ssp. pseudolagopina (Sorensen) Bocher and Carex marina var. pseudolagopina (Sorensen) Bocher. The complete bibliography is given to validate Hultén's trinomial: Eriophorum angustifolium Honckeny ssp. subarcticum (Vassil.) Hultén ex Kartesz & Gandhi.

KEY WORDS: Floristics, nomenclature, Cyperaceae, Carex, Cyperus, Eleocharis, Eriophorum, Phaeocephalum, Rhynchospora, Scirpus, Boott, Hooker, Small

INTRODUCTION

Continuing with the "NOMENCLATURAL NOTES FOR THE NORTH AMERICAN FLORA" (Kartesz & Gandhi 1989, 1990a, b, c, 1991a, b, c, d), a ninth note in the series is presented here toward advancing our understanding of North American plant names.

CYPERACEAE Carex emmonsii

Carex emmonsii Dewey, a manuscript name, was proposed in Torrey's work (Ann. Lyceum Nat. Hist. New York 3:411. 1836) as a nomen novum for both C. alpestris sensu Schwein. & Torr. (non Allioni 1785, nec Lam. 1789) and C. davisii Dewey (Amer. J. Sci. 10:279. 1826, non Schwein. & Torr. 1825). Since C. emmonsii did not require a description for validation, the authorship of this name is questionable, i.e., whether Dewey alone or Dewey ex Torr. is the correct author. This situation is similar to the nomenclatural problem of Vilfa vaginiflora Torr. ex A. Gray (see Kartesz & Gandhi [Phytologia 69:307-309. 1990] on Sporobolus vaginiflorus [Torr. ex A. Gray] Wood). We conclude that Dewey ex Torrey is the author, since Torrey was responsible for validation of this name.

Regarding typification of Carex emmonsii, it must be typified by the type of C. davisii Dewey. However, the specimens studied by Dewey were not located. Rettig (Sida 13:451. 1989) "lectotypified" C. davisii Dewey by Williamstown's 1828 collection (NY) and typified C. emmonsii by the preceding lectotype. Since Dewey did not study Williamstown's collection (collected two years after Dewey's publication), Rettig (Sida 14:133. 1990) corrected his earlier lectotypification as a neotypification.

Carex albicans Willd. var. emmonsii (Dewey ex Torr.) Rettig, Sida 14:133. 1990. Carex emmonsii Dewey ex Torrey, Ann. Lyceum Nat. Hist. New York 3:411. 1836. Carex davisii Dewey, Amer. J. Sci. 10:279. 1826, non Schwein. & Torr. 1825. Carex novae-angliae Schwein. var. emmonsii (Dewey ex Torr.) Carey in A. Gray, Manual 556. 1848. NEOTYPE (vide Rettig l.c.): U.S.A. Massachusetts: 1828, Williamstown (NY).

Carex marina ssp. pseudolagopina

Following Kartesz & Gandhi (1991e), the quadrinomial Carex marina Dewey ssp. pseudolagopina (Sorensen) Bocher var. pseudolagopina is recognized with two trinomials as given below.

Carex marina Dewey ssp. pseudolagopina (Sorensen) Bocher and var. pseudolagopina (Sorenson) Bocher, Feddes Rep. 80:106. 1969. BASIONYM: Carex pseudolagopina Sorensen, Meddel. Om Gronl. 101(4):167. 1937.

Cyperus haspan

Kern (1974, pp. 624-625) considered Cyperus haspan L. as an orthographic error for C. halpan L. On p. 625, Kern stated that "Linnaeus misspelled the vernacular name. According to Art. 73 of the Code (example of Cluta renghas) this orthographic error must be corrected." In our correspondence with Thieret (KNK), he speculated that Linnaeus might have deliberately spelled the epithet as haspan. Hence, we decided to investigate this problem.

In Sinhalese (native language of Sri Lanka), the name halpan refers to a sedge in rice fields (hal = rice; pan = sedge). Trimen (J. Linn. Soc. Bot. 24:135. 1887) believed that the name halpan referred to Fimbristylis globulosa (Retz.) Kunth (= F. umbellaris [Lam.] Vahl) alone. Later, Trimen (Handb. Fl. Ceylon 5:26, 57. 1900) applied this vernacular name to both C. haspan and F. umbellaris. Seemingly following Trimen's 1900 treatment, several authors, such as Willis (Revis. Cat. Pl. Ceylon 101-102. 1911), Fonseka & Vinasithamby (Provision. Index Local Names Fl. Pl. Ceylon 28. 1971), and Koyama (Fl. Ceylon 5:203-204, 303. 1985) applied the name halpan to both C. haspan and F. umbellaris. However, Gunawardena (Gen. & Sp. Pl. Zeylaniae 208. 1968) applied the name halpan to C. haspan alone. Wilson (Cyperaceae Newslett. 9:8. 1991), who rejected Kern's analysis and accepted the name C. haspan, followed Trimen's 1887 treatment by assigning the name halpan to F. umbellaris alone. Of these authors, Gunawardena, Fonseka, and Vinasithamby are natives of Sri Lanka.

It appears that Hermann (Mus. Zeylanicum 23. 1717) was the first to associate the vernacular name halpan with Cyperus ("HALPAN. Gramen Cyperinum junceum longissimum."). Burman (Thes. Zeylanica 108. 1737) copied Hermann's treatment, but misspelled halpan as haspan (Wilson erroneously attributed Thes. Zeylanica to Hermann.). Linnaeus (Fl. Zeylanica 37. 1747) cited references to both "... Haspan ... Burm." and "Halpan. Herm." Later, Linnaeus (1753, p. 45) used the name C. haspan and referenced his Fl. Zeylanica. Therefore, it is evident that Linnaeus was aware of both spellings and deliberately chose the spelling haspan. Linnaeus' usage of haspan must be construed as an intentional orthographic error, which he had done with few other epithets (e.g., Fagus sylvatica L. [medieval Latin] instead of F. silvatica [classical Latin]). We concur with Thieret and with Wilson that Art. 73 is inapplicable in this case and that haspan is the correct epithet.

Cyperus haspan L., Sp. Pl. 45. 1753.

Cyperus involucratus

Throughout much of North America, the umbrella sedge has generally been known by the name Cyperus alternifolius L. In Malaysia, Kern (1974, p. 618) used the name C. flabelliformis Rottb. for this taxon. He described its stem apices as being scabrulous, its glumes as being ovate, and its fruits as being broadly ellipsoid or slightly obovoid, apiculate, yellowish brown and 3/5-3/4 x 1/2 mm. Kern remarked that the "very closely related C. alternifolius L. differs by its smooth stem, ...lanceolate glumes, and narrowly oblong blackish nuts measuring c. 1 by 1/3 mm. It is native to Madagascar, Mauritius, and the Mascarenes; not found growing wild in Malaysia." Kuekenthal (1936, p. 193) recognized C. flabelliformis at subspecific rank (C. alternifolius ssp. flabelliformis [Rottb.] Kuekenthal), whereas Baijnath (1975) recognized it to be specifically distinct under the earlier name: C. involucratus Rottb.

In his analysis of this complex, Baijnath provided additional morphological and anatomical characters to substantiate the separation of Cyperus involucratus from C. alternifolius. Without referencing Baijnath, Koyama (1979, p. 257) assigned the Caribbean umbrella sedge to C. alternifolius subsp. flabelliformis. Although DeFilipps (in Tutin et al. 1980, p. 286) was aware of Baijnath's work, he assigned the European umbrella sedge to C. alternifolius. Cyperus alternifolius and C. involucratus are similar in gross morphology, but some of their macro- and micromorphological differences clearly warrant their independent specific recognition. For the North American flora, we follow Tucker (1983, p. 12) and recognize the name C. involucratus for the umbrella sedge.

Cyperus involucratus Rottb., Descr. Pl. Rar. 22. 1772.

Cyperus flabelliformis Rottb., Descr. et Icon. Rar. 42. 1773. Cyperus alternifolius L. subsp. flabelliformis (Rottb.) Kuekenthal in Engl., Pflanzenr. IV. 20 (Heft 101):193. 1936.

Cyperus alternifolius auct. non L.

Eleocharis acutangula

Svenson (1957, p. 511) recognized the name Eleocharis fistulosa (Poir.) Schultes (published in 1824; based on Scirpus fistulosus Poir., published in 1804) for a pantropical Eleocharis species found in Texas. Correll & Johnston (1970, p. 271), and Correll & Correll (1972, p. 375), Kartesz & Kartesz (1980), Soil Conservation Service (1982, p. 63), Hatch et al. (1990, p. 35), and Johnston (1990, p. 13) followed Svenson. Unfortunately, the basionym S. fistulosus Poir. is a later homonym of S. fistulosus Forsk. (published in 1775). Because

of its illegitimacy, the name S. fistulosus Poir. must not be considered for purpose of priority (ICBN Art. 45 Note 2), and Poiret must not be cited as the parenthetical author (ICBN Art. 49). The name E. fistulosa must be considered to be a nom. nov., with its priority from 1824 (ICBN Art. 72 Note 1).

Kern (1974, p. 525) and Hooper (1976, p. 671) recognized the name *Eleocharis* acutangula (Roxb.) Schultes (based on *Scirpus acutangulus* Roxb., published in 1820). We concur and accept the name *E. acutangula*.

Eleocharis acutangula (Roxb.) Schultes, Mant. 2:91. 1824. BASIONYM: Scirpus acutangulus Roxb., Fl. Ind. 1:213. 1820.

Scirpus fistulosus Poir., Encyc. 6:749. 1804, non Forsk., 1775. Eleocharis fistulosa Schultes, Mant. 2:91. 1824.

Eleocharis geniculata

In the protologue of Scirpus geniculatus L., Linnaeus (1753, p. 48) included a mixture of two species (later known as Eleocharis geniculata [L.] Roemer & Schultes [characterized by eseptate, 0.2-0.4 mm wide stems, and 3-7 mm long and 3-4 mm wide spikelets] and E. elegans [Kunth] Roemer & Schultes [characterized by transversely septate, 4-10 wide stems, and 1-2 cm long and 4-7 mm wide spikelets]). Linnaeus' description ("culmo tereti nudo, spica subglobosa terminali") along with his first reference (to "Scirpus culmo nudo, spica terminali subrotunda. Hort. Cliff. 21.") as well as his second reference p.p. (to "Juncus aquaticus geniculatus, capitulis equiseti, minor. Sloan. Jam. 37.") pertained to the former species, whereas the remainder of his second reference (to "Juncus aquaticus geniculatus, capitulis equiseti, major. Sloan. Jam. 37.") pertained to the latter species (fide Wilson 1990). In his second edition, Linnaeus (1762, p. 71) altered his description slightly ("culmo terreti nudo, spica oblonga terminali"). It is clear that the oblong shape of the spikelet applied more to E. elegans than to E. geniculata. Hence, confusion has existed in the past regarding the application of the Linnaean binomial.

In the early 1930s, Dandy investigated this problem and conveyed his results to both Furtado and Svenson (fide Svenson 1939, p. 50). Based on Dandy's results, Furtado (1937, pp. 293, 298) lectotypified the name Scirpus geniculatus by a specimen referable to Eleocharis geniculata. Prior to Furtado's typification, Svenson (1937, p. 259) treated E. elegans as a synonym of E. geniculata. However, subsequent to the typification, Svenson (1939, p. 51) recognized E. geniculata and E. elegans to be two distinct species. Wilson (1990, p. 7) stated that both Furtado and Svenson independently lectotypified the name S. geniculatus. However, except for quoting excerpts from Dandy's

letter on the lectotypification and for referencing Furtado's publication, Svenson had no comment on the typification. Hence, Furtado alone was responsible for the lectotypification of the name S. geniculatus.

Eighteen years later, Svenson (1957, p. 533, as a note) reversed his 1939 position by rejecting Scirpus geniculatus as a nom. conf. and accepting (pp. 520-521) the name Eleocharis caribaea (Rottb.) Blake (in place of E. geniculata). His treatment suggested that he rejected Furtado's lectotypification. Correll & Johnston (1970, p. 274), Correll & Correll (1972, p. 384), Voss (1972, p. 342), Soil Conservation Service (1982, p. 63), and Hatch et al. (1990, p. 35) perhaps following Svenson's 1957 work, recognized the name E. caribaea, whereas several well known sedge specialists such as Kern (1974, p. 536), Hooper (1976, p. 672), Koyama (1979, p. 232), Walters (in Tutin et al. 1980, p. 282), and Wilson (1990) followed Furtado's lectotypification and accepted the name E. geniculata in place of E. caribaea. We concur with the preceding authors and continue to recognize E. geniculata.

Eleocharis geniculata (L.) Roemer & Schultes, Syst. Veg. 2:150. 1817. BA-SIONYM: Scirpus geniculatus L., Sp. Pl. 48. 1753. LECTOTYPE (vide Furtado, l.c.): BM.

Scirpus caribaeus Rottb., Descr. Pl. Rar. 24. 1772. Eleocharis caribaea (Rottb.) Blake, Rhodora 20:24. 1918.

Eriophorum angustifolium ssp. subarcticum

For the North American flora, we follow Hultén's reduction of Eriophorum subarcticum Vassil. to E. angustifolium Honckeny ssp. subarcticum (Vassil.) Hultén (Kongl. Svenska Vetenskapsakad., band 8, no. 5:58, 243. 1962). Unfortunately, this combination remains invalid to date for the following reasons. First, on pp. 58 and 243, Hultén did not provide complete bibliographic details regarding the basionym. Second, the bibliography section of Hultén's work has no reference on Vassiljev. Therefore, Hultén did not meet the requirements of ICBN Art. 33.2 for a new combination. The complete bibliographic details of the basionym are given below to validate Hultén's subspecific name.

Eriophorum angustifolium Honckeny ssp. subarcticum (Vassil.) Hultén ex Kartesz & Gandhi, comb. et stat. nov. BASIONYM: Errophorum subarcticum Vassil., Bot. Mater. Gerb. Bot. Inst. Komarov Akad. Nauk SSSR 13:58. 1950. TYPE: East Asia, Ochotensis, near Najachan, Sep 1938, Medvedev & Nepli s.n. (?LE).

Phaeocephalum: Nomenclaturally Superfluous, Taxonomic Synonym

Rhynchospora Vahl (Enum. Pl. 2:229. 1806) is a conserved generic name, with its type R. alba (L.) Vahl (based on Schoenus albus L.) also conserved. Ehrhart (Beitr. 4:146. 1789) proposed Phaeocephalum as an unitary name for S. fuscus L. (= R. fusca [L.] Ait. f.). In the Paris Congress (Lanjouw et al. 1956, Art. 68) and prior to that, Phaeocephalum Ehrh. was treated as an illegitimate name; however, in the Montreal Congress (Lanjouw et al. 1961, Art. 20 Note 2) and presently (Art. 20 Ex. 10), it is merely regarded as an unitary name, i.e., not a generic name.

House (Amer. Midl. Naturalist 6:201. 1920) revived Phaeocephalum, ascribed it to Ehrhart, cited Schoenus fuscus as the type, and made 43 new combinations within it. House's treatment was based on the belief that Phaeocephalum was validly published by Ehrhart and that it had priority over Rhynchospora. House did not provide a description for Phaeocephalum; however, his citation of Rhynchospora as a synonym (an indirect reference to its generic description) inadvertently validated Phaeocephalum as a generic name. At the time of House's publication, Rhynchospora was neither conserved nor typified.

Farr et al. (1979: 1305) mentioned that Phaeocephalum Ehrh. ex House is a nomenclatural synonym of Rhynchospora, which suggested homotypy. However, such a view is refuted here. Phaeocephalum was typified by a type different from that of Rhynchospora (heterotypy); therefore, the former must be classified as a taxonomic synonym of the latter.

The removal of Rhynchospora fusca from Rhynchospora may remove the taxonomic superfluity from Phaeocephalum, but such a removal would not remove the illegitimacy from Phaeocephalum, since the latter was validated by House's reference to the circumscription of Rhynchospora (i.e., Phaeocephalum included the circumscription of Rhynchospora). Hence, the name Phaeocephalum must be classified as nomenclaturally superfluous when published, and thus illegitimate.

Rhynchospora berteroi

Based on Bertero's collection from Guadeloupe, Sprengel (Neue Entd. 1:241. 1820) proposed "Hypoelytrum berterii." Since Sprengel used the epithet in substantive, "H. berterii" is to be treated as an orthographic error and must be corrected to "H. berteroi" (ICBN Rec. 73C.1a). In Rhynchospora Vahl, it must be cited as R. berteroi (Spreng.) C.B. Clark. (cf. Thomas [1984, p. 34] used both "H. berterii" and R. berteroi).

Rhynchospora divergens and R. pusilla

Based on Chapman's manuscript name, Curtis (Amer. J. Sci. II. 7(21):409. 1849) described Rhynchospora divergens and attributed it to Chapman. Curtis remarked that R. divergens "has the closest affinity with R. pusilla, Chapm. mss., from which it differs in several particulars, especially in the achenium which is not rugulose." Curtis' remarks suggested that the achenium of R. pusilla is rugulose. He further stated that R. pusilla lacked hypogynium bristles. These were the only two descriptive characters provided by Curtis for R. pusilla. Perhaps unaware of Curtis' treatment, Chapman (1860, p. 528) proposed these two taxa as spp. nov.

Prior to the 1987 Congress (in Berlin), Curtis' treatment of Rhynchospora pusilla could have been rejected as an incidental mention (Voss et al. 1983, ICBN Art. 34.1c) and thus, its publication in Chapman's 1860 work would be valid. However, Art. 34.1c, pertaining to incidental mention, was dropped at the Berlin Congress (Greuter et al. 1988) rendering R. pusilla to be validly published in Curtis' work. Thomas (1984, p. 35) erred in attributing R. pusilla to Chapman alone. Since the types for both Chapman's and Curtis' treatments are the same, Chapman's spp. nov. must be considered as isonyms (Nicolson, Taxon 24:461-466. 1975).

Rhynchospora divergens Chapman ex Curtis, Amer. J. Sci. II. 7:409. 1849.

Rhynchospora pusilla Chapman ex Curtis, Amer. J. Sci. II. 7:409. 1849.

Rhynchospora globularis

Koyama (1979, pp. 297-298) attributed Rhynchospora globularis to "(Chapman) Small [Man. Southeast. Fl. 184. 1933; comb. invalida] ex Gale" (Rhodora 46:243. 1944) and cited its basionym: R. cymosa Ell. var. globularis Chapman (Koyama erroneously attributed R. cymosa to Nuttall.) Koyama mentioned R. pinetorum Britt. & Small ex Small (l.c., p. 1933) as a synonym.

Small (l.c.) neither proposed Rhynchospora globularis as a comb. nov. nor cited its basionym. Moreover, in his list of new names proposed in his work, Small (p. 1503) did not list R. globularis. Perhaps, for these reasons, Koyama considered Small's combination as invalid. However, we emphasize the fact that if Koyama's treatment is accepted, then R. pinetorum (published in 1933) would be the correct name for this complex, since it would have priority over R. globularis (published in 1944) at specific rank. Our analysis follows.

For his combination, Small cited Chapman to be the parenthetical author. This citation must be construed as an indirect reference to Chapman's variety. Therefore, we conclude that it was Small's intention to make the combination and that he met the requirements of ICBN Art. 32.3 for valid publication of new combinations made prior to 1953.

Rhynchospora globularis (Chapman) Small, Man. S.E. Fl. 184. 1933. BA-SIONYM: Rhynchospora cymosa Ell. var. globularis Chapman, Fl. S. U.S. 525. 1860.

Scirpus leptolepis

Koyama (1962, p. 930) proposed Scirpus subterminalis Torr. var. cylindricus and cited the following as synonyms: S. canbyi A. Gray, S. cylindricus (Torr.) Britt., S. etuberculatus (Steud.) O. Kuntze, S. leptolepis Chapman, S. macranthus Boeckl., S. maritimus L. var. cylindricus Torr., and S. torreyi Olney.

We recognize Scirpus etuberculatus (incl. S. macranthus) and S. torreyi as distinct from the above taxa. For the remainder of the complex, we conclude that S. leptolepis is the correct name at specific rank.

Scirpus leptolepis Chapman, Fl. S. U.S. 520. 1860.

Scirpus maritimus L. var. cylindricus Torr., Ann. Lyceum Nat. Hist. New York 3:325. 1836. Scirpus cylindricus (Torr.) Britt., Trans. New York Acad. Sci. 11:79. 1892. Scirpus canbyi A. Gray, Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Philadelphia 18. 1864.

Authorship of New Cyperaceae Names Proposed in Small's 1903 Work

Small (1903, pp. 1327-1328) listed 25 new Cyperaceae names (treated on pp. 161-221, 1321), either as sp. nov. or comb. nov. He erred in listing Rhynchospora intermedia (Chapman) Britt. as a comb. nov., since it had been published previously in Britton's work (Trans. New York Acad. Sci. 11:87. 1892). Furthermore, Small failed to list two names: Cyperus careyi Britt. sp. nov. and Dichromena floridensis Britt. sp. nov.; hence, the correct number is 26, of which 21 were ascribed to Britton, four to Small, and one to Harper. Regarding the authorship of the 21 names ascribed to Britton, recent authors differ, with some attributing them to Britton alone (Gleason, New Britt. & Brown Ill. Fl. 1:285, 290. 1952) and others to Britton ex Small (Gale 1944, pp. 105, 172, 233, 262; Thomas 1984, pp. 60, 77, 79). Our analysis follows.

On p. 161 (in a footnote), Small stated that the Cyperaceae treatment was prepared "with the assistance of Dr. Nathaniel Lord Britton," i.e., Small prepared Cyperaceae with the assistance of Britton. Therefore, both Small and Britton are the authors of this treatment, with Small being the first author.

Regarding the authorship of Dichromena floridensis, Thomas (p. 79) argued that the description "is in Small's style and Britton indicated a previous

lack of familiarity with the species by describing it as new (D. inaguensis) in 1920." We disagree with Thomas' analysis. First, since Small was the major author, editor, and publisher of his work, it is logical to assume that he edited contributions from others, such as Pteridophyta by Underwood and Poaceae by Nash. Second, even though D. inaguensis is presently treated conspecifically with D. floridensis, Britton was not the first (and would not be the last) to describe a new species and to disregard its closeness to his previously published species. Untold volumes could be amassed documenting the plethora of miscalculations by workers who erred in their taxonomic judgments in treating trivial geographical morphs as new biological taxa, or by those who described new taxa under misapplied names. Hence, Britton's proposal of D. inaguensis as a new endemic species, with its type from the Bahamas, must be treated within that realm of taxonomic miscalculation. However, in no way should this reflect on his lack of familiarity with D. floridensis, which was based on a type from Florida. In checking for Thomas' comments on Small's footnote (which acknowledges Britton's assistance on the treatment of Cyperaceae), we found none. Thus, we assert that Britton alone is the author of those 21 names, Small of four names, and Harper ex Small & Britt. of one name, as listed below.

- 1) Carex radiata (Dewey) Small
- 2) Carex reniformis (Bailey) Small
- 3) Cyperus careyi Britt.
- 4) Cyperus floridanus Britt.
- 5) Cyperus nashii Britt.
- 6) Cyperus pollardii Britt.
- 7) Cyperus plankii Britt.
- 8) Cyperus subuniflorus Britt.
- 9) Dichromena floridensis Britt.
- 10) Eleocharis macrostachya Britt.
- 11) Eleocharis praticola Britt.
- 12) Eleocharis ravenelii Britt.
- 13) Fimbristylis drummondii (Torr. & Gray) Britt.

- 14) Fimbristylis perpusilla Harper ex Small & Britt.
- 15) Rhynchospora curtissii Britt.
- 16) Rhynchospora earlei Britt.
- 17) Rhynchospora indianolensis Small
- 18) Rhynchospora microcephala (Britt.) Britt.
- 19) Rhynchospora mixta Britt.
- 20) Rhynchospora perplexa Britt.
- 21) Rhynchospora planckii Britt.
- 22) Rhynchospora prolifera Small
- 23) Rhynchospora smallii Britt.
- 24) Scleria curtisii Britt.
- 25) Scleria glabra (Chapman) Britt.
- 26) Stenophyllus coarctatus (Ell.) Britt.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to: Dr. Larry E. Brown (SBSC) and Dr. John W. Thieret (KNK) for their valuable comments on the manuscript; and to Dr. Rogers McVaugh (NCU), Ms. R. Schallert (US), and Dr. D.A. Simpson (K) for the literature used in this study.

REFERENCES

- Baijnath, II. 1975. A study of Cyperus alternifolius L. sens. lat. (Cyperaceae). Kew Bull. 30:521-526.
- Chapman, A.W. 1860. Fl. S. U.S. New York, New York.
- Correll, D.S. & H.B. Correll. 1972. Aquat. Wetland Pl. S.W. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 16030 DNL 01/72. U.S. Govt. Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Correll, D.S. & M.C. Johnston. 1970. Manual of the Vascular Plants of Texas. Texas Research Foundation, Renner, Texas.
- Farr, E.R., Leussink, J.A. & Stafleu, F.A. (eds.). 1979. Index Nominum Genericorum (Plantarum), vol. III: Pegaeophyton-Zyzygium. Regnum Veg., vol. 102.
- Furtado, C.X. 1937. The nomenclature of types. Gardens Bull. Straits Settlement 9(3):285-309.
- Gale, S. 1944. Rhynchospora, section Eurhynchospora, in Canada, the United States and the West Indies. Rhodora 46:89-134, 159-197, 207-249, 255-278.
- Greuter, W. (Ch. Ed. Comm.) 1988. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Adopted by the Fourteenth International Botanical Congress, Berlin, Jul-Aug 1987. Regnum Veg. 118.
- Hatch, S.L, K.N. Gandhi, & L.E. Brown. 1990. Checkl. Vasc. Pl. Texas. Texas Agr. Exper. Sta. Misc. Pub. no. 1655.
- Hooper, S.H. 1976. Cyperaceae. Pp. 655-701 in: C.J. Saldanha & D.H. Nicolson, Fl. Hassan Dist. Amerind Publishers, New Delhi, India.
- Johnston, M.C. 1990. The Vascular Plants of Texas, a List Updating the Manual of the Vascular Plants of Texas. Published by the author, Austin, Texas.

- Kartesz, J.T. 1991. Syn. Checkl. Vasc. Fl. U.S. Canad. Greenl., ed. 2 (in press). Timber Press, Portland, Oregon. ___ & K.N. Gandhi. 1989. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - I. Phytologia 67:461-468. ____ & ____. 1990a. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - II. Phytologia 68:421-427. _____ & ____. 1990b. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - III. Phytologia 69:129-137. ____ & ____. 1990c. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - IV. Phytologia 69:301-312. ____ & ____. 1991a. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - V. Phytologia 70:194-208. & _____ & Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - VI. Phytologia 71:58-65. & _____. 1991c. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - VII. Phytologia 71:87-100. & _____. 1991d. Nomenclatural notes for the North American flora - VIII. Phytologia 71:269-280. ___ & ____. 1991e. Varietal autonyms of nontypical subspecies validly published combinations under today's Code. Taxon 40:308-310. & R. Kartesz. 1980. Syn. Checkl. Vasc. Fl. U.S. Canad. Greenl. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Kern, J.H. 1974. Fl. Malesiana. I. 7(3): Cyperaceae. Noordhoff International Publishing, Leyden, The Netherlands. Koyama, T. 1962. The genus Scirpus Linn.: some North American aphylloid species. Canad. J. Bot. 40:913-937. ___. 1979. Cyperaceae. Pp. 220-320 in: R.A. Howard, Fl. Lesser Antilles, vol. 3: Monocotyledoneae. Arnold Arboretum, Harvard Univer-
 - Kuekenthal, G. 1936. Cyperaceae-Scirpoideae-Cypereae. Pp. 1-671 in: A. Engler (ed.), Pflanzenr. IV. 20, Heft 101.

sity, Jamaica Plain, Massachusetts.

- Lanjouw J. (Ch. Ed. Comm.) 1956. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Adopted by the Eighth International Congress, Paris, July 1954. Regnum Veg. 8.
- . 1961. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Adopted by the Ninth International Congress, Montreal, August 1959. Regnum Veg. 23.
- Linnaeus, C. 1753. Sp. Pl., 2 vols. Stockholm, Sweden. Facsimile edition issued by the Ray Society. London, U.K.
- _____. 1762-63. Sp. Pl., ed. 2, 2 vols. Stockholm, Sweden.
- Small, J.K. 1903. Fl. S.E. U.S. Published by the author, New York, New York.
- Soil Conservation Service. 1982. National List Sci. Pl. Names, vols. 1 & 2. USDA, SCS-TP 159. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- Stafleu, F.A. (Ch. Ed. Comm.) 1972. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Adopted by the Eleventh International Congress, Leningrad, August 1969. Regnum Veg. 82.
- _____ & R.S. Cowan. 1979. TL-2 Taxonomic Literature 2: H-Le. Regnum Veg. 98.
- Svenson, H.K. 1937. Monographic studies in the genus Eleocharis. IV. Rhodora 39:210-231, 236-273.
- _____. 1939. Monographic studies in the genus *Eleocharis*. V. Rhodora 41:43-77.
- _____. 1957. N. Amer. Fl. 18(9): Scirpeae (Poales; Cyperaceae). The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, New York.
- Thomas, W.W. 1984. The systematics of Rhynchospora section Dichromena. Mem. New York Bot. Gard. 37:1-116.
- Tucker, G.C. 1983. The taxonomy of Cyperus (Cyperaceae) in Costa Rica and Panama. Syst. Bot. Monogr. 2:1-85.
- Tutin, T.G., V.H. Heywood, N.A. Burges, D.M. Moore, D.H. Valentine, S.M. Walters, & D.A. Webb. 1980. Fl. Europaea, vol. 5: Alismataceae to Orchidaceae. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, London, U.K.
- Voss, E.G. 1972. Michigan Fl., part I: Gymnosperms and Monocots. Bull. Cranebook Inst. Sci., vol. 55.

- _____ (Ch. Ed. Comm.). 1983. International Code of Botanical Nomenclature. Adopted by the Thirteenth International Congress, Sydney, August 1981. Regnum Veg. 111.
- Wilson, K.L. 1990. Typification and application of *Scirpus geniculatus* L. Cyperaceae Newslett. 7:6-8.